

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Ex Parte Quayle Office Action of May 14, 2008, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 81-99 remain pending.

Applicants initially thank the examiner for the indication that claims 81-99 are allowable if the present objections are overcome.

The Specification stands objected to as allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The Action alleges that the original specification and figures fails to provide support for the claim language of one or more computer readable media. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Support for the claim language can be found throughout Applicants' original Specification and figures. For example, support may at least be found on p. 35, ll. 10-19, p. 45, l. 24 to p. 46, l. 16, p. 49, ll. 1-20, p. 50, ll. 3-30, and p. 74. Applicants note that one of ordinary skill would be able to read the original Specification and figures and know the meaning of the terms in the claims to be ascertainable by reference to the description. In order to further illustrate the support in Applicants' original Specification and figures, Applicants have amended the Specification herewith. As such, support for the claim language of one or more computer readable media is now included specifically within the specification. As such, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 87-92 stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as allegedly being a substantial duplicate of claims 81-86, respectively. Applicants respectfully disagree. A final Office Action mailed December 19, 2006, in the present matter, included a duplicate claims warning indicating the same basis for objection in the future that is noted in the present Ex Parte Quayle Action. Applicants' response on March 12, 2007, noted some differences in the claims. In an Advisory Action mailed March 15, 2007, in the present matter, the Office admitted that independent claims 81 and 87 do not share common claim scope for each claim. The Advisory Action specifically states, "Applicant's argument is persuasive and objection of said claims is hereby

withdrawn." As such, withdrawal of the present objection to claims 87-92 under 37 CFR 1.75 is respectfully requested in accordance with the same.

### **CONCLUSION**

All objections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner find that a telephonic or personal interview would expedite passage to issue of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below. Applicants look forward to passage to issue of the present application at the earliest convenience of the Office.

Respectfully submitted,  
**BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.**

Date: June 17, 2008  
1100 13th Street, N.W.  
Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 824-3000

By: /John M. Fleming/  
John M. Fleming  
Registration No. 56,536